

SNUTP 94-32

SOGANG-HEP 189/94

March 30, 1994

Batalin-Tyutin Quantization of the (2+1) dimensional nonabelian Chern-Simons field theory

Won Tae Kim*

*Center for Theoretical Physics and Department of Physics,
Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea*

Young-Jai Park†

*Department of Physics and Basic Science Research Institute,
Sogang University, C.P.O. Box 1142, Seoul 100-611, Korea*

ABSTRACT

The (2+1) dimensional nonabelian Chern-Simons theory coupled to complex scalar fields is quantized by using the Batalin-Tyutin canonical Hamiltonian method which systematically embeds second-class constraint system into first-class one. We obtain the gauge-invariant nonabelian Wess-Zumino type action in the extended phase space.

* E-mail address : wtkim@phya.snu.ac.kr

† E-mail address : yjpark@ccs.sogang.ac.kr

To quantize the second-class constraint system, which does not form a closed constraint algebra in Poisson brackets, the Dirac method has been widely used in the Hamiltonian formalism [1]. The brackets (commutators) compatible with constraints and the dynamical equations of motion in the second-class system are evaluated without choosing gauge conditions or additional constraints since the Dirac matrices are invertible. In general, since the resulting brackets are field-dependent and nonlocal, and have a serious ordering problems between field operators, these are under unfavorable circumstances in finding canonically conjugate pairs.

On the other hand, quantizations of the first-class constraint systems [2,3] have been well appreciated in a gauge invariant manner, i.e., preserving Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) symmetry [4,5]. If the second-class constraint system can be converted into first-class one in an extended phase space, Dirac brackets can not be needed and then the remaining quantization program is to follow the method of Ref. [2-5]. This procedure has been extensively studied by Batalin, Fradkin, and Tyutin [6,7] in the canonical formalism. In the path-integral framework, especially concentrating on the second-class gauge algebra, which is related to the gauge anomaly, Faddeev and Shatashvili [8] introduced the Wess-Zumino action [9], which cancels the gauge anomaly and gives the first-class gauge algebra. After their work, in the Hamiltonian method, the Wess-Zumino actions for the various models [10,11,12] have been studied following Refs. [6,7].

Recently, Banerjee [13] has pointed out an interesting application of Batalin-Tyutin Hamiltonian method [7] to the second-class constraint system of the abelian Chern-Simons (CS) field theory [14-16], which yields a strongly involutive constraint algebra in an extended phase space, and obtained a new abelian Wess-Zumino type action, which cannot be derived in the usual path-integral framework. As shown in his work, the nature of second-class constraint algebra originates from the symplectic structure of CS term, not due to the local gauge symmetry breaking. There are some other interesting examples in this direction [17].

In this paper, we shall apply the Batalin-Tyutin Hamiltonian method [7] to the nonabelian CS field theory by using the recent progress of nonabelian Batalin-Tyutin quantization [18], which involves the weakly involutive constraint algebra. The phase

space partition function is constructed in order to connect with the Lagrangian formulation, and explicitly evaluated in two special gauges, unitary and Faddeev-Popov gauges [19]. As a result, the nonabelian Wess-Zumino like action is obtained in a local gauge invariant fashion in the extended phase space by finding the suitable gauge transformation of new dynamical fields.

Let us now consider the (2+1) dimensional nonabelian CS theory coupled to the nonabelian scalar fields whose dynamics is given by

$$S_0 = \int d^3x \left(\kappa \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \text{tr}(A_\mu \partial_\nu A_\rho - \frac{2}{3} i A_\mu A_\nu A_\rho) + (D_\mu \phi)^\dagger (D^\mu \phi) \right), \quad (1)$$

where ϕ is an N-component scalar field, which transforms according to the fundamental representation of the gauge group, and the covariant derivative is $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i A_\mu$ (the matrix-valued gauge field $A_\mu = A_\mu^a T^a$). We adopt the conventions, $g_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(+, -, -)$, and $\epsilon^{012} = +1$. The matrices T^a 's in the fundamental representation are Hermitian group generators satisfying $[T^a, T^b] = i f^{abc} T^c$, and are normalized as $\text{tr}(T^a T^b) = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab}$. Note that the gauge invariance of the nonabelian CS term requires the quantization of the dimensionless constant κ , $\kappa = \frac{n}{4\pi} (n \in \mathbb{Z})$ [14].

The canonical momenta of gauge fields and scalar fields are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_0^a &\approx 0, \\ \Pi_i^a &= \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^{ja} \quad (i = 1, 2), \\ \Pi_\phi &= (D_0 \phi)^\dagger, \\ \Pi_\phi^\dagger &= (D_0 \phi). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The Π_0^a and Π_i^a are primary constraints [1]. The canonical Hamiltonian is

$$H_c = \int d^2\mathbf{x} \left(\Pi_\phi \Pi_\phi^\dagger + (D_i \phi)^\dagger (D_i \phi) - A_0^a G^a \right), \quad (3)$$

where G^a is the Gauss' law constraint defined by

$$G^a = \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon^{ij} F_{ij}^a + J_0^a. \quad (4)$$

Here, the field strength is $F_{ij}^a = \partial_i A_j^a - \partial_j A_i^a + f^{abc} A_i^b A_j^c$, and the charge density is $J_0^a = -i(\Pi_\phi T^a \phi - \phi^\dagger T^a \Pi_\phi^\dagger)$. The time evolution of the Gauss' law constraint (4) generates no

more additional constraints. To obtain the maximally irreducible constraint system, we redefine the above primary and secondary constraints similarly to the abelian case in Refs. [16,20] as follows

$$\Omega_0^a = \Pi_0^a \approx 0, \quad (5)$$

$$\Omega^a = (D_i \Pi^i)^a + J_0^a + \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i A_j^a \approx 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\Omega_i^a = \Pi_i^a - \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^{ja} \approx 0. \quad (7)$$

Then the first-class constraint algebras by using the Poisson brackets are

$$\begin{aligned} \{\Omega_0^a(x), \Omega_i^b(y)\} &= \{\Omega_0^a(x), \Omega^b(y)\} = 0, \\ \{\Omega^a(x), \Omega^b(y)\} &= f^{abc} \Omega^c(x) \delta^2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \\ \{\Omega_i^a(x), \Omega^b(y)\} &= f^{abc} \Omega_i^c(x) \delta^2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and the second-class constraint algebra is given by

$$\{\Omega_i^a(x), \Omega_j^b(y)\} \equiv \Delta_{ij}^{ab}(x, y) = -\kappa \epsilon_{ij} \delta_{ab} \delta^2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \quad (9)$$

where we denote $x = (t, \mathbf{x})$ and the two-space vector $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, x^2)$. Therefore, Ω_0^a and Ω^a form first-class constraint system, and we defer them.

Following to the Batalin-Tyutin quantization method [7,18], let us now introduce new nonabelian auxiliary fields Φ^{ia} to convert the second-class constraint Ω_i^a into first-class one in the extended phase space, and assume the following Poisson algebra satisfying

$$\{\Phi^{ia}(x), \Phi^{jb}(y)\} = W_{ab}^{ij}(x, y). \quad (10)$$

The modified constraint $\tilde{\Omega}_i^a$ in the extended phase space is given by

$$\tilde{\Omega}_i^a(\Pi_i^a, A_i^a, \Phi^{ia}) = \Omega_i^a + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Omega_i^{a(n)} \quad (\Omega_i^{a(n)} \sim (\Phi^{ia})^n) \quad (11)$$

satisfying the boundary condition, $\tilde{\Omega}_i^a(\Pi_i^a, A_i^a, 0) = \Omega_i^a$. The first order correction in the infinite series is

$$\Omega_i^{a(1)}(x) = \int d^2 \mathbf{y} X_{ij}(x, y) \Phi^{ja}(y), \quad (12)$$

and the first-class constraint algebra of $\tilde{\Omega}_i^a$ requires the condition as follows,

$$\Delta_{ij}^{ab}(x, y) + \int d^2 \mathbf{w} d^2 \mathbf{z} X_{ik}^{ac}(x, w) W_{cd}^{kl}(w, z) X_{lj}^{db}(z, y) = 0. \quad (13)$$

As was emphasized in Ref. [13,17], there is a natural arbitrariness in choosing W_{ab}^{ij} and X_{ij}^{ab} from Eq. (13), which corresponds to canonical transformation in the extended phase space [6,7]. We take the simple solutions as

$$\begin{aligned} W_{ab}^{ij}(x, y) &= \epsilon^{ij} \delta_{ab} \delta^2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \\ X_{ij}^{ab}(x, y) &= -\sqrt{\kappa} g_{ij} \delta_{ab} \delta^2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which are compatible with Eq. (13) as it should be. Note that the above choices remarkably simplify the constraint algebra and give the compact involutive Hamiltonian. Then, the modified constraint $\tilde{\Omega}_i^a$ gives a strongly first-class constraint algebra,

$$\{\tilde{\Omega}_i^a(x), \tilde{\Omega}_j^b(y)\} = 0, \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{\Omega}_i^a = \Omega_i^a - \sqrt{\kappa} g_{ij} \Phi^{ja}$. However, this is not a whole story for the constraint algebra. The modified constraint $\tilde{\Omega}_i^a$ is still second-class constraint because it does not form a first-class algebra with Ω^a as easily seen from Eq. (8). Therefore, in order to obtain the fully first-class constraint algebra (weakly first class in the nonabelian structure), we should also modify Ω^a as

$$\tilde{\Omega}^a = \Omega^a + Y^a, \quad (16)$$

where we assume that Y^a is only a function of new fields, Φ^{ia} and require two conditions to maintain the weakly first-class constraint structure as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \{Y^a(x), Y^b(y)\} &= f^{abc} Y^c(x) \delta^2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \\ \{\Phi^{ia}(x), Y^b(y)\} &= f^{abc} \Phi^{ic}(x) \delta^2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

with the consistent choice of Y^a as

$$Y^a(x) = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} f^{abc} \Phi^{ib} \Phi^{jc}. \quad (18)$$

Then, one can easily check that the modified $\tilde{\Omega}_i^a$ and $\tilde{\Omega}^a$ form the fully first-class constraint algebra,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\Omega_0^a(x), \tilde{\Omega}_i^b(y)\} &= \{\Omega_0^a(x), \tilde{\Omega}^b(y)\} = 0, \\ \{\tilde{\Omega}^a(x), \tilde{\Omega}^b(y)\} &= f^{abc} \tilde{\Omega}^c(x) \delta^2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}), \\ \{\tilde{\Omega}_i^a(x), \tilde{\Omega}_j^b(y)\} &= 0, \\ \{\tilde{\Omega}_i^a(x), \tilde{\Omega}^b(y)\} &= f^{abc} \tilde{\Omega}_i^c(x) \delta^2(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

by using Eqs. (16) and (18).

Let us now work out the involutive Hamiltonian [7] in the extended phase space which is similar to the abelian case [13] except the nonabelian effect due to the extended gauge group structure. It is given by the infinite series [7],

$$\tilde{H} = H_c + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} H^{(n)}. \quad (20)$$

Using the solution for the involution of $\tilde{H}$ for the nonabelian case [18], it is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H^{(n)} &= -\frac{1}{n} \int d^2\mathbf{x} d^2\mathbf{y} d^2\mathbf{z} \Phi^{ia}(x) W_{ij}^{ab}(x, y) X_{bc}^{jk}(y, z) G_k^{c(n-1)}(z) \\ &= \frac{1}{n\sqrt{\kappa}} \int d^2\mathbf{x} \epsilon^{ij} \Phi^{ia}(x) G_j^{a(n-1)}(x) \quad (n \geq 1), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where W_{ij}^{ab} and X_{ab}^{ij} are the inverse matrices of W_{ab}^{ij} and X_{ij}^{ab} respectively, and Eq. (14) is used in the second line in Eq. (21). For our case, the generating functions $G_k^{(n)}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} G_i^{a(0)} &= \{\Omega_i^{a(0)}, H_c\} = J_i^a - \kappa \epsilon^{ij} (D_j A_0)^a, \\ G_i^{a(1)} &= \{\Omega_i^{a(0)}, H^{(1)}\}_{\mathcal{O}} + \{\Omega_i^{a(1)}, H_c\}_{\mathcal{O}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \epsilon_{ij} \phi^\dagger (T^a T^b + T^b T^a) \Phi^{jb} + \sqrt{\kappa} g_{ij} f^{abc} \Phi^{jb} A_0^c, \\ G_i^{a(n)} &= 0 \quad (n \geq 2), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where the symbol $\mathcal{O}$ in Eq. (22) represents that the Poisson brackets are calculated among the original variables, i.e., $\mathcal{O} = (\Pi_i^a, A^a)$. Then, after the $n = 2$ finite truncations, we obtain the final expression for the Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} = H_c &+ \int d^2\mathbf{x} \left(-A_0^a \left(\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} f^{abc} \Phi^{ib} \Phi^{jc} + \sqrt{\kappa} (D_i \Phi^i)^a \right) \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \epsilon_{ij} \Phi^{ia} J^{ja} - \frac{1}{2\kappa} g_{ij} \Phi^{ia} \Phi^{jb} \phi^\dagger (T^a T^b + T^b T^a) \phi \right). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Note that the compact form of involutive Hamiltonian (23) is a result of the symmetric choice of X_{ij}^{ab} (14) which is compared to the abelian case [13]. By using the Poisson brackets, the following involutive relations are given,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\Omega_0^a, \tilde{H}\} &= \tilde{\Omega}^a - (D_i \tilde{\Omega}^i)^a, \\ \{\tilde{\Omega}^a, \tilde{H}\} &= -f^{abc} A_0^b \tilde{\Omega}^c, \\ \{\tilde{\Omega}_i^a, \tilde{H}\} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

In the above constraint analysis, from Eqs. (19) and (24), we see that the original second-class constraint system is converted into the first-class system if one introduces two fields, which are conjugate each other in the extended phase space. The origin of second-class constraint is due to the symplectic structure as the abelian case [13], and the modifications of primary constraints Ω_i^a are similarly done. However, since the set $(\Omega_0^a, \Omega^a, \tilde{\Omega}_i^a)$ does not become first-class constraints, the modification of Ω^a should be also needed to make the fully first-class constraint system (19).

Next we consider the partition function of the model in order to present the Lagrangian corresponding to $\tilde{H}$ in the (canonical) Hamiltonian formalism. We relabel the constraints as $\Gamma_0^a = \Omega_0^a$, $\Gamma_i^a = \tilde{\Omega}_i^a$, and $\Gamma_3^a = \tilde{\Omega}^a$. Then, the phase space partition function is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}\Pi^{\mu a} \mathcal{D}A^{\mu a} \mathcal{D}\Pi_\phi^\dagger \mathcal{D}\phi^\dagger \mathcal{D}\Pi_\phi \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\Phi^{ia} \prod_{\alpha, \beta=0}^3 \delta(\Gamma_\alpha^a) \delta(G_\beta^b) | \det\{\Gamma_\alpha^a, G_\beta^b\} | e^{iS}, \\ S &= \int d^3x (\Pi^{\mu a} \dot{A}_\mu^a + \Pi_\phi^\dagger \dot{\phi} + \Pi_\phi \dot{\phi} + \Phi^{2a} \dot{\Phi}^{1a}) - \int dt \tilde{H}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where we regard new fields (Φ^{1a}, Φ^{2a}) as conjugate pairs [13] satisfying the Poisson algebra (10) and Eq. (14), and G_β^b are gauge fixing conditions to make the nonvanishing determinant of Γ_α^a and G_β^b . The integration with respect to the momenta $\Pi^{\mu a}$, $\Pi_\phi^\dagger$ and Π_ϕ , and the exponentiation of the $\delta(\Gamma_3^a)$ by the Fourier transformation with variables ξ^a , and the change of variables as $A_0^a \rightarrow A_0^a + \xi^a$ give the compact local action as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S &= S_0 + S_{\text{WZ}}, \\ S_{\text{WZ}} &= \int d^3x \left(-\epsilon_{ij} \text{tr}(\Phi^i \partial_0 \Phi^j) - 2\sqrt{\kappa} \text{tr}(\Phi^i F_{i0}) - 2i\epsilon_{ij} \text{tr}(A_0 \Phi^i \Phi^j) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \epsilon_{ij} \text{tr}(\Phi^i J^j) + \frac{1}{\kappa} \phi^\dagger (\Phi^i \Phi_i) \phi \right) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

with the corresponding measure

$$[\mathcal{D}\mu] \equiv \mathcal{D}A^{\mu a} \mathcal{D}\phi^\dagger \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\Phi^{ia} \mathcal{D}\xi^a \prod_{\beta=0}^3 \delta(G_\beta^a[A_0^a + \xi^a, A_i^a, \Phi^{ia}]) | \det\{\Gamma_\alpha^a, G_\beta^b\} | \quad (27)$$

where $J_i^a = -i((D_i \phi)^\dagger T^a \phi - \phi^\dagger T^a (D_i \phi))$. Note that as expected, if we choose the unitary gauge, i.e., $\Phi^{ia} = 0$, the original theory is recovered.

It seems appropriate to comment that the gauge invariance of S_{WZ} should be maintained because the second-class constraint structure only comes from the symplectic

structure of Chern-Simons term. It is implemented by the following *extended* gauge transformations involving the transformation of the new fields,

$$\begin{aligned}
A'_\mu &= UA_\mu U^{-1} + iU\partial_\mu U^{-1}, \\
\phi' &= U\phi, \\
\phi^{\dagger'} &= \phi^\dagger U^{-1}, \\
\Phi^{i'} &= U\Phi^i U^{-1},
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where $\Phi^i = \Phi^{ia}T^a$, and the gauge function $U = e^{i\theta^a T^a}$. Note that the Wess-Zumino action in Eq. (26) is gauge invariant in spite of the lack of the manifest Lorentz invariance. On the other hand, since the unitary gauge recovered the manifestly Lorentz invariant original action, following the Fradkin-Vilkovisky theorem [2,3], the actual invariance is maintained from the fact that the final result for the partition function Z is independent of the gauge fixing conditions.

For the Faddeev-Popov gauge [19] which does not involve the momenta in the gauge fixing conditions, the following nontrivial form of S_{WZ} is given by integrating out the momentum, Φ^{2a} in Eqs. (26) and (27), which is a canonical conjugate with Φ^{1a} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\text{WZ}} &= \int d^3x \left(\frac{\kappa}{2} ((D_0\lambda)^a + \sqrt{\kappa}F^{20a} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}J^{1a}) M_{ab}^{-1} ((D_0\lambda)^b + \sqrt{\kappa}F^{20b} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}J^{1b}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2\kappa} \lambda^a M_{ab} \lambda^b + \lambda^a (\sqrt{\kappa}F^{10a} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}J^{2a}) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

with the measure

$$[\mathcal{D}\mu] = \mathcal{D}A^{\mu a} \mathcal{D}\phi^\dagger \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\lambda^a \mathcal{D}\xi^a \prod_{\beta=0}^3 \delta(G_\alpha^a[A_0^a + \xi^a, A_i^a, \lambda^a]) \mid \det\{\Gamma_\alpha^a, G_\beta^b\} \mid (\det M_{ab})^{-1/2}, \tag{30}$$

where we redefine Φ^{1a} as λ^a , and $M_{ab} = \phi^\dagger (T^a T^b + T^b T^a) \phi$. Note that the local gauge symmetry of the Wess-Zumino action naturally also survives in the configuration space. This suggests that the origin of our second-class system is irrelevant to the conventional gauge-variant Wess-Zumino like action [8,10,11] which cancels the local gauge anomaly of the second-class system. Interestingly just like the abelian case [13], the choice of $\lambda=0$ does not recover the original theory.

In conclusions, we have applied the Batalin-Tyutin Hamiltonian quantization method to the nonabelian CS field theory as a good illustration to show explicitly how to con-

vert the second-class system into first-class one since it is special in that the gauge constraint algebra is weakly first-class due to the nonabelian group structure and the origin of the second-class algebra is related to the symplectic structure irrelevant to the local gauge anomaly. As a result, the gauge-invariant Wess-Zumino type action was obtained. For further study, the role of the extended gauge symmetry in the extended phase space (or configuration space) and the other physical significance of the Wess-Zumino like action remain.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Y.-W. Kim for discussions. One of us (W.T. Kim) was supported in part by the Korea Science and Engineering Foundation through the Center for Theoretical physics (1994). The present study was also supported in part by the Basic Science Research Institute Program, Ministry of Education, 1993, Project No. 236.

References

- [1] P. A. M. Dirac, “*Lectures on quantum mechanics*” (Belfer graduate School, Yeshiba University Press, New York 1964).
- [2] E. S. Fradkin and G. A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B55** (1975) 224.
- [3] M. Henneaux, Phys. Rep. **C126** (1985) 1.
- [4] C. Becchi, A. Rouet and R. Stora, Ann. Phys. [N.Y.] **98** (1976) 287; I. V. Tyutin, Lebedev Preprint 39 (1975).
- [5] T. Kugo and I. Ojima, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **66** (1979) 1.
- [6] I. A. Batalin and E. S. Fradkin, Nucl. Phys. **B279** (1987) 514; Phys. Lett. **B180** (1986) 157.
- [7] I. A. Batalin and I. V. Tyutin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A6** (1991) 3255.
- [8] L. D. Faddeev and S. L. Shatashvili, Phys. Lett. **B167** (1986) 225; O. Babelon, F. A. Shaposnik and C. M. Vialett, Phys. Lett. **B177** (1986) 385; K. Harada and I. Tsutsui, Phys. Lett. **B183** (1987) 311.
- [9] J. Wess and B. Zumino, Phys. Lett. **B37** (1971) 95.
- [10] T. Fujiwara, Y. Igarashi and J. Kubo, Nucl. Phys. **B341** (1990) 695.
- [11] Y.-W. Kim, S.-K. Kim, W. T. Kim, Y.-J. Park, K.Y. Kim, and Y. Kim, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 4574; R. Banerjee, H. J. Rothe and K. D. Rothe, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1994) (in press).
- [12] T. Fujiwara, Y. Igarashi and J. Kubo, Phys. Lett. **B251** (1990) 427; Y. Igarashi, H. Imai, S. Kitakado, J. Kubo, and H. So, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A5** (1990) 1663.
- [13] R. Banerjee, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993) R5467.
- [14] R. Jackiw, “*Topological Investigations of Quantized Gauge Theories*”, edited by S. Treiman, R. Jackiw, B. Zumino and E. Witten (World Scientific, Singapore 1985).

- [15] G. Semenoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61** (1988) 517; G. Semenoff and P. Sodano, Nucl. Phys. **B328** (1989) 753.
- [16] R. Banerjee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 17; Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993) 2905.
- [17] N. Banerjee, S. Ghosh and R. Banerjee, Nucl. Phys. B (1994) (in press); Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 1996.
- [18] N. Banerjee, R. Banerjee and S. Ghosh, “*Quantization of second-class systems in the Batalin-Tyutin formalism*”, Saha Institute Report, March 1994 (hep-th 9403069).
- [19] L. D. Faddeev and V. N. Popov, Phys. Lett. **B25** (1967) 29.
- [20] R. Banerjee, A. Chatterjee and V. V. Sreedhar, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **122** (1993) 254.